



# Meeting Minutes

## Housing Authority of Mono County

Board of Supervisors Chambers

### SPECIAL MEETING

County Courthouse  
Bridgeport, California 93517

July 10, 2007

11:00 a.m. Meeting Called to Order by Chairman Hunt at 11:45 a.m.

### OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE HOUSING AUTHORITY

No one spoke.

#### 1) BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Board Member Reid reported on the following:

- (1) Chris from Mono Basin RPAC contacted him. At their last meeting they toured sites at the Pumice Plant. Also, regarding the possibility of working with Mammoth Lakes Housing Authority, Chris is supportive. Lee Vining is ready to move on affordable housing, and there may be a mutual endeavor with Mammoth Lakes Housing. Board Member Hunt said people are starting to leave Lee Vining because prices are so high.

Board Member Hazard reported on the following:

- (1) At the last Housing Authority meeting, the Board discussed the issue of trying to find funding to assist employees with affordable housing; he expressed disappointment in the lack of progress. A goal of the Housing Authority has been to help working people; he will want to see more grant programs to accomplish this goal.

#### 2) HOUSING MITIGATION ORDINANCE UPDATE (Larry Johnston, Mark Magit)

**ACTION:** Review housing mitigation ordinance status and administrative issues, and provide any desired direction to staff.

Mark Magit, County Counsel, gave a PowerPoint presentation (a copy of the handout is on file in the Clerk's Office). There are several things to consider when requiring developers to build work-force housing:

- Unit design criteria. How specific do we want to be? How should we move forward to get design criteria? How proactive should we be concerning design standards?
- Sales price criteria. How do we determine sales price criteria?
- Eligibility. How do we determine eligibility? Should we use residence and employment as eligibility requirements? Should we use similar criteria as rental units? What assets should people be able to have? Monterey County has an asset limit. If we develop eligibility lists, who will manage it?

- Resale price: retaining affordability versus appreciation of real property. Should someone in subsidized housing get to benefit from appreciation? Sacramento keeps housing affordable, but some percentage of the equity goes to the owner—they can capture some equity; there are different models.
- Procedures. Someone will need to manage this aspect.

At this stage, staff needs direction from the Housing Authority about where to go with some of these issues.

Board Member Bauer asked if the June Lake review process covers the design review for the “rodeo grounds” project. Scott Burns, Community Development, said the focus has been on the exterior portion of the project. Bauer asked if the application conflicted with the mitigation ordinance. Larry Johnston, Community Development, said there may be some conflicts. Burns said he has considered bringing this issue to the Housing Authority for input. Bauer supported this idea. Johnston added that if their specific plan varies from the ordinance, they will have to go through the Planning Commission and the Board process. Bauer suggested having a workshop with the developer and the Housing Authority. Magit pointed out that the Board of Supervisors is an appellate body, and if this same body (Housing Authority) specifies what they want to see and then acts as the appellate body, the developer can find the process flawed and litigate. He suggested there will be a lot of interface between the County, the Planning staff and CEQA to work out the housing mitigation process. However, it would be appropriate for the Housing Auth to see a hypothetical plan.

Referring to procedural options, Bauer specified her preference for in-house administration, and suggested that this person could probably provide grants administration and oversee Housing Authority paperwork. She said she would like to see salary costs for this position. David Wilbrecht, CAO, said he will present alternatives to the Board at a later time.

Regarding eligibility requirements, Chairman Hunt said he leans towards the Mammoth Lakes Housing model, which has very strict requirements. He suggested they use the MLH strategies as a starting point for discussion, and then develop their own categories and strategies. Board Member Hazard said County issues are significantly different, so they will have to base decisions on internal discussions.

Board Member Reid asked if the County would be better served if a project is community specific rather than implementing a broad policy (“one-size fits all”), since communities may have different priorities. Chairman Hunt agreed with this point of view.

Scott Burns said they are moving ahead on the Crowley Lake Estates project; the financial analysis will be funded out of existing housing funds not to exceed \$10,000, and Mammoth Lakes Housing will provide administrative services. They are also considering funding a strategic plan; if the Board is interested, he will continue to work with MLH (the estimated cost is \$35,000 to be paid from the \$1.2 million grant). Chairman Hunt said they need to go through a strategic planning process to really define what they want to do. It would be nice to have a matrix set up so as development happens, the County has requirements for affordable housing in place. Board Member Hazard asked how individual pieces of property will be managed; both Board Member Reid’s and Board Member Hazard’s areas will be pressured to provide housing for out-of-county residents.

Larry Johnston, Community Development, reported the following:

- Proposed having a mid-year review at the September meeting to report on what is happening in the marketplace; will report on sales statistics and building permits.
- Still receiving large-home fees, and issuing about 60-70 permits on average per year. Many developers are opting for a secondary unit rather than paying a fee. The amount of money collected is around \$10,000-15,000.
- Regarding Sierra Business Park, the Board will soon see an appeal on a storage facility (appealing the number of units required).
- RESCO has broken ground, and mitigated through the purchase of a lot in Mammoth Lakes. Chairman Hunt said Mammoth Lakes Housing is interested in this lot. Johnston said maybe the next developer will build the units; there are good options with having the land.

**3) Rental Housing Protocol (Larry Johnston, Mark Magit)**  
**ACTION:** Conduct PowerPoint workshop on potential protocols and criteria for renting county-owned housing, and provide any desired direction to staff.

Mark Magit, County Counsel, gave a PowerPoint presentation (on file in the Clerk's Office). The following points were highlighted and discussed:

- Primary issues: eligibility requirements, rental rates, policies and procedures. The current policies and procedures are a good starting point.
- Eligibility requirements based on employment. The Mammoth Housing policy is focused on the workforce. Chairman Hunt said they have had a lot of discussion at MLH, and the consensus is to give opportunities to people who are committed to the area; this is the reason for the strong employment requirement. Magit suggested including a variance component, allowing an employer to make a housing request on behalf of an employee. Hunt suggested this issue could be part of overall strategy discussions. Board Member Hazard suggested that rentals should have a lower threshold than purchases. He supported the idea of an employer request. Magit said having minimal requirements help establish eligibility before applying a point system. The initial step with the eligibility requirement is to set criteria to determine whether someone is eligible or not eligible. The minimum criteria could be that a person lives or works in the County for a period time, with a variance to allow employers to make a request. The Board agreed to establish a three-month employment requirement, and allow employers to make requests on behalf of their employees.
- Eligibility requirements based on residency. The question was raised about also using residency as an eligibility requirement to accommodate retirees who participate in the community through volunteering, people who are disabled, or people who work part time. Mammoth Lakes Housing uses employment as their first eligibility requirement. Once a person is in the unit, the residency requirement kicks in; to retain eligibility, the unit must be the primary residence for 9 months each year, and subleasing is limited and requires prior approval. Big housing facilities have a property manager to ensure that criteria are met. Magit said the goal is for people to be full-time residents, as defined by the criteria. Board

Member Hazard asked about documenting that someone is in the unit for the nine months; Magit said the property manager does this. Hazard suggested the criteria should just state "primary residence". Magit asked the Board if they want a residency requirement in addition to employment. Chairman Hunt said there are many variables in Mono County with the transient population. Board Member Bauer suggested not using residency as an initial criteria; the County created the Housing Authority to deal with workforce housing issues. Board Member Reid asked staff to present a recommendation and justification at a future meeting. Board Member Hazard asked if disabled and elderly people should be included; Magit said the Housing Authority will need to decide.

- Income requirements. The recommendation is to follow Mammoth Lakes Housing (page 3 of the presentation). Magit asked the Board if they want to use MLH's format for converting assets to income or have an asset cap. He said he can come back with a recommendation. Board Member Bauer said people who have real property assets should not be eligible. Magit said according to MLH, people who own real property in Mono or Inyo Counties are not eligible; if they own property in another place, the value is converted to income. Board Member Bauer said she likes the Monterey model; Magit said he will bring this issue back before the Board. Board Member Hazard suggested the income amount should be at 200% of AMI rather than 120% in order to help more people.

Regarding eligibility criteria, Magit suggested using the priority list outlined on page 4 of the PowerPoint handout, eliminating the items that don't apply.

Board Member Bauer asked if volunteer first responders would be eligible since they are technically not County employees. Scott Burns, Community Development, said in this case a fire district is governmental and first responders would be considered for eligibility. Board Members Bauer and Hazard agreed that volunteers should get credit. Magit said he will add a volunteer component.

- Rental amount. Board Member Hazard expressed concern that high rents would make it difficult for people to get ahead. Magit said there are options to consider that will lower the rent amount; staff can consult and make a recommendation later.
- Application process. A property manager would monitor this process, which would include an annual review regarding a renter's eligibility and status. Magit recommend following Mammoth Lakes Housing's policies and procedures (outlined on page 5), which could include a variance to allow for employers to request consideration.

In conclusion, Magit said with the Board direction provided, he will schedule a workshop in August to address issues. Board Member Reid said the issue of pets needs to be discussed.

Board Member Hazard asked about the status of the 2<sup>nd</sup> house in Benton. Burns said a few people are interested, but the County has delayed renting it pending policy clarification. Johnston said they want to rent the property (if possible) to someone who works in Benton, such as a teacher, a fire district employee, or a county employee. They are considering this rental as an incentive for new hires, to be used as interim housing for employees in transition. Board Member Hunt agreed that they need to stick to the eligibility criteria. Johnston said they can make a greater effort to rent the house now that they have a direction.

#### 4) Land Tenure Update (**Scott Burns**)

**ACTION:** Receive update of land tenure planning activities, and provide direction to staff.

Scott Burns, Community Development, asked for direction on the visioning process in Chalfant and Benton. People are serious about putting forth applications for subdivisions; his office is working to set up meetings with land management agencies to review options. Tri-Valley seems to be a focal point right now. Regarding land tenure, Burns said the process is quite lengthy and controversial. One land owner has approached the County several times, so there needs to be a discussion with the appropriate people about the impending application. Board Member Hazard said he didn't hear a lot of desire for the land tenure process from the Chalfant community, but the Hammil Valley expressed support. It is important to let the visioning process in Tri-Valley work out so citizens can explain what they have in mind.

Relating to Tri-Valley, Burns said the Benton tribe owns a house across from the Chalfant Community Center, and the tribe is interested in an exchange with the County (specifically property in the Highway 6 area). Board Member Hazard said options regarding this house have not yet been formally explored. He suggested that Burns pursue this opportunity; the Board agreed.

Chairman Hunt asked if the agricultural nature of the Hammil Valley is being eroded due to subdividing; he also asked about the interest in agricultural land in the Coleville/Walker area. Burns said the Planning Commission intends to come back with a draft chapter to the general plan promoting ways to mitigate impacts of dividing agricultural land; at this time, they don't have actual procedures or directives to implement. Bridgeport Valley has some criteria, but there is no guidance yet for Antelope Valley—there is no consensus from agricultural land owners. The Planning Department is considering the concept of clustering development on smaller parcels. Another approach would be to implement transfer development credits, but this is difficult. All these ideas are being discussed at the planning level. Board Member Hazard pointed out that land in the Tri-Valley area is not viable for agriculture; there is pressure to develop the land into small parcels since there are no large ranches that will be taken out of production. The area is not currently losing production land to development.

Burns referred to a parcel of property in the north part of the County (currently being considered for sale), and asked the Board if they are interested in preserving the property for housing. Marshall Rudolph, County Counsel, said the sale of this property is on next week's Board of Supervisors agenda; previously there was no indication that the County had a use in mind for the property.

As a final comment, Burns said the Mono Basin RPAC is interested in moving forward with the land tenure process, and Tom's Place and Pine Glade are also interested in moving forward. Board Member Hazard said he would like to see Tom's Place move forward, but has concerns with Pine Glade.

- 5) **Community Development Block Grant Update (Scott Burns)**  
**ACTION:** Receive update on current CDBG grant, consider upcoming Notice of Funding Availability, and provide any desired direction to staff.

Scott Burns, Community Development, said the first-time homebuyers program has guidelines that a current applicant doesn't quite meet. The guidelines specify that at least one member of the household has worked in Mono County for a minimum of one year for 30 hours per week. The applicant doesn't currently meet the 30 hours per week, but over the course of a year, the time averages out to 30 hours per week. This applicant currently works in Bishop, and her long-term goal is to get a position in Mono County. This young woman is trying to get into her first house in Crowley Lake. Burns said he thought in this case he could apply a liberal interpretation to the guidelines since they are looking for applicants, and they have a lot of money to loan.

Board Member Bauer supported this idea. Board Member Hazard asked about the efficacy of providing housing for Inyo County workers. This raised the question of whether a person should get a job first in Mono County or get housing first. Bauer said every time they lose a family in the June Lake community, a part-time resident or 2<sup>nd</sup> home owner buys the property. She said having permanent residents adds more to the community. Burns said the applicant grew up in the community, and Chairman Hunt responded that he would like to open the door to returning residents. Board Member Hazard said he is opposed to not having a clear policy; he is not opposed to this specific request, and will support moving forward.

Burns said he will bring the existing guidelines back for tweaking; there are conditions associated with the grant money, but there may be some latitude. Board Member Bauer said she likes the idea of a point system to help determine eligibility. Chairman Hunt said they need a strategic discussion, and he would like a workshop format in which to develop a strategic plan, otherwise this will be a piecemeal process. Burns suggested having a meeting in August to deal with some of these issues. A strategic plan will eliminate piecemeal discussions.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> item for discussion is a \$35,000 grant for a job retention program for June Lake. Burns said this is ready to go, and if the Board agrees, he will ask the same consultant doing the Intrawest project to do a broader community plan (the consultants are interested in doing the community plan); doing this may lead to a cost savings. The Board agreed with Burns' recommendation.

- 6) Joint Meeting with Mammoth Lakes Housing (**Scott Burns**)  
**ACTION:** Discuss May 8, 2007, joint meeting outcomes and provide desired direction to staff.

Scott Burns, Community Development, said things have changed since the meeting of May 8<sup>th</sup>. He asked if the Board wanted a debriefing. The Board had no questions.

Meeting adjourned @ 1:28 p.m.

*The Housing Authority will meet again on Tuesday, August 14, 2007.*

§§§§§